arXiv:1403.1013v3 [cs.IT] 12 Oct 2015

Adversary's Ignorance of Transmission Time Increases Covert Throughput

Boulat A. Bash, *Member, IEEE*, Dennis Goeckel, *Fellow, IEEE*,
and Don Towsley, *Fellow, IEEE*

UMass Technical Report UM-CS-2014-001

Abstract

The recent *square root law* (SRL) for covert communication demonstrates that Alice can reliably transmit $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n})$ bits to Bob in n uses of an additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) channel while keeping ineffective any detector employed by the adversary; conversely, exceeding this limit either results in detection by the adversary with high probability or non-zero decoding error probability at Bob. This SRL is under the assumption that the adversary knows *when* Alice transmits (if she transmits); however, in many operational scenarios he does not know this. Hence, here we study the impact of the adversary's ignorance of the time of the communication attempt. We employ a slotted AWGN channel model with $T(n)$ slots each containing n symbol periods, where Alice may use a single slot out of $T(n)$. Provided that Alice's slot selection is secret, the adversary needs to monitor all $T(n)$ slots for possible transmission. We show that this allows Alice to reliably transmit $\mathcal{O}(\min\{\sqrt{n \log T(n)}, n\})$ bits to Bob (but no more) while keeping the adversary's detector ineffective. To achieve this gain over SRL, Bob does not have to know the time of transmission provided $T(n) < 2^{c_{\mathrm{T}} n}$, $c_{\mathrm{T}} = \mathcal{O}(1)$.

B. A. Bash is with Raytheon BBN Technologies, Cambridge, MA.

D. Goeckel is with the Electrical and Computer Engineering Department, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA.

D. Towsley is with the College of Information and Computer Sciences, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA.

This research was sponsored by the National Science Foundation under grants CNS-1018464, CNS-0964094, and ECCS-1309573.

An abridged version of this manuscript was presented at the International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT) 2014.

This work has been submitted to the IEEE for possible publication. Copyright may be transferred without notice, after which this version may no longer be accessible.

I. INTRODUCTION

Recent revelations of massive surveillance programs [1] have emphasized the necessity of secure communication systems that do not just protect the content of the user's message from being decoded, but prevent the detection of its transmission in the first place. Indeed, encrypted data or even just the transmission of a signal can arouse suspicion, and even the most theoretically robust cryptographic security scheme can be defeated by a determined adversary using non-computational methods such as side-channel analysis. Covert, or *low probability of detection/intercept* (LPD/LPI) communication capability is thus very important in extremely sensitive situations (e.g., during military operations or for organization of civil unrest).

In the covert communication scenario, Alice transmits a message to Bob over a noisy channel while the adversary, warden Willie, attempts to detect her transmission. The channel from Alice to Willie is also subject to noise. Thus, while Alice transmits low-power covert signals to Bob, Willie attempts to classify these signals as either noise on his channel or signals from Alice. We recently showed that the *square root law* (SRL) governs covert communication: provided that Alice and Bob pre-share a secret of sufficient length and Alice can tolerate a small probability of being detected by Willie, she can reliably transmit $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n})$ bits to Bob in n uses of an additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) channel while keeping ineffective any detector employed by Willie. Conversely, attempting to transmit more that $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n})$ either results in detection by Willie with probability one or non-zero decoding error probability at Bob as $n \to \infty$ [2], [3]. Follow-on work has addressed the size of the pre-shared secret [4], [5], the optimal constant hidden by the asymptotic (big-$\mathcal{O}$) notation [5], [6], network aspects of covert communication [7], [8], extensions of SRL to bosonic channels where the adversary is only limited by the laws of quantum mechanics [9], [10], and, finally, practical limitations on the adversary that improve the covert throughput to beyond the SRL limit [11]–[14].

Here we explore another limitation on the adversary's capabilities. Studies of covert communication up to now assume that Willie knows when Alice may start to transmit (if she does).

However, there are many practical scenarios where this assumption can be relaxed and Alice's communication start time is unknown to Willie. For example, a possible transmission time can be pre-arranged in advance. Alice's message may also be much shorter than the total time available to transmit it (e.g., a few seconds out of the day when both Alice and Bob are available). Thus, since Willie does not know when Alice may transmit, he has to monitor a much longer time period than the duration of Alice's transmission. Here we show how Alice can leverage Willie's ignorance of her transmission time to transmit significant additional information to Bob.



Fig. 1: Slotted channel: each of the $T(n)$ slots contains n symbol periods. Alice and Bob use slot t_{A} to communicate.

In our scenario, Alice communicates to Bob over an AWGN channel. Willie also has an AWGN channel from Alice. Unlike the setting in [2], [3], the channel is slotted, as described in Figure 1. Each of $T(n)$ slots contains n symbol periods, where $T(n)$ is an increasing function of n. If Alice used all $nT(n)$ symbol periods for transmission, then, by the square root law in [2], [3], she could reliably transmit $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{nT(n)})$ covert bits[1] to Bob. However, Alice uses only a single slot t_{A}, which she keeps secret from Willie, who is thus forced to monitor all $T(n)$ slots. A naïve application of the square root law [2], [3] allows Alice to reliably transmit $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n})$ covert bits in this scenario. We demonstrate that Alice can transmit $\mathcal{O}\left(\min\{\sqrt{n\log T(n)}, n\}\right)$

[1]Throughout this paper we employ asymptotic notation [15, Ch. 3.1] where $f(n) = \mathcal{O}(g(n))$ denotes an asymptotic upper bound on $f(n)$ (i.e. there exist constants $m, n_0 > 0$ such that $0 \leq f(n) \leq mg(n)$ for all $n \geq n_0$), $f(n) = o(g(n))$ denotes an upper bound on $f(n)$ that is not asymptotically tight (i.e. for any constant $m > 0$, there exists constant $n_0 > 0$ such that $0 \leq f(n) < mg(n)$ for all $n \geq n_0$), and $f(n) = \omega(g(n))$ denotes a lower bound on $f(n)$ that is not asymptotically tight (i.e. for any constant $m > 0$, there exists constant $n_0 > 0$ such that $0 \leq mg(n) < f(n)$ for all $n \geq n_0$).

bits reliably on this channel while maintaining arbitrarily low probability of detection by Willie. Conversely, we show that the transmission of $\omega(\sqrt{n \log T(n)})$ bits either results in Alice being detected with high probability or unreliable communication.

The cost of covert communication on the AWGN channel is the secret that Alice and Bob share before the transmission. Remarkably, we demonstrate that the *multiplicative* increase (by a factor of $\sqrt{\log T(n)}$) in the number of covert bits that Alice can transmit reliably to Bob does not require Bob to know the timing of the transmission if $T(n) < 2^{c_{\mathrm{T}} n}$, where $c_{\mathrm{T}} > 0$ is a constant; to realize the $\sqrt{\log T(n)}$ gain when $T(n) \geq 2^{c_{\mathrm{T}} n}$ only an additive expense of an extra $\log T(n)$ secret bits is needed to indicate to Bob the slot employed by Alice. Timing is thus a very useful resource for covert communication. It also necessitates a vastly different analysis than that in [2], [3]. Specifically, the relative entropy based bounds on the probability of detection error employed in [2], [3] are too loose to yield our achievability results, and we therefore have to apply other techniques from mathematical statistics.

The main result of this paper is the following:

Theorem. *Suppose the channel between Alice and each of Bob and Willie experiences independent additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) with constant power $\sigma_{\mathrm{b}}^2 > 0$ and $\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2 > 0$, respectively. Also suppose that, if Alice chooses to transmit, she uses one of the $T(n)$ slots chosen randomly. Each slot contains n symbol periods, where $T(n) = \omega(1)$. Then, for any $\epsilon > 0$, Alice can reliably transmit $\mathcal{O}\left(\min\{\sqrt{n \log T(n)}, n\}\right)$ bits to Bob in a selected slot while maintaining a probability of detection error by Willie greater than $\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon$. Conversely, if Alice tries to transmit $\omega(\sqrt{n \log T(n)})$ bits using n consecutive symbol periods, either Willie detects with arbitrarily low probability of error or Bob cannot decode her message with arbitrary low probability of decoding error as $n \to \infty$.*

After introducing our slotted channel model in Section II, we prove the achievability and the converse in Sections III and IV, respectively. We discuss the relationship of our paper to other work in covert communication in Section V and conclude in Section VI.

II. PREREQUISITES

A. Channel Model



Fig. 2: System framework: Alice and Bob share a secret before transmission. If Alice chooses to transmit, she encodes information into a vector of real symbols $\mathbf{f} = \{f_i\}_{i=1}^{n}$ and uses random slot t_{A} to send it on an AWGN channel to Bob (to ensure reliable decoding t_{A} is secretly shared with Bob before the transmission if $T(n) \geq 2^{c_{\mathrm{T}} n}$, where c_{T} is a constant). Upon observing the channel from Alice, Willie has to classify his vector of readings $\mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{w}}$ as either an AWGN vector $\mathbf{z}_{\mathrm{w}} = \{z_i^{(\mathrm{w})}\}_{i=1}^{nT(n)}$ or a vector that contains a slot with transmissions corrupted by AWGN.

We use the discrete-time slotted AWGN channel model with real-valued symbols depicted in Figures 1 and 2. The channel has $T(n)$ slots, each containing n symbol periods. Alice selects slot t_{A} uniformly at random prior to transmission. If Alice chooses to transmit, she sends a vector of n real-valued symbols $\mathbf{f} = \{f_i\}_{i=1}^{n}$ during slot t_{A}. The AWGN on Bob's channel is described by an independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) sequence $\{z_i^{(\mathrm{b})}\}_{i=1}^{nT(n)}$ of $nT(n)$ zero-mean Gaussian random variables with variance σ_{b}^2 (i.e., $z_i^{(\mathrm{b})} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{\mathrm{b}}^2)$). Bob receives $\mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{b}} = \{\mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{b}}(t)\}_{t=1}^{T(n)}$ where $\mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{b}}(t) = [y_{(t-1)n+1}^{(\mathrm{b})}, \ldots, y_{tn}^{(\mathrm{b})}]$ is a vector of observations collected during slot t. If Alice transmits during slot t_{A}, $y_{(t_{\mathrm{A}}-1)n+i}^{(\mathrm{b})} = f_i + z_{(t_{\mathrm{A}}-1)n+i}^{(\mathrm{b})}$. For any slot that is not used for transmission, $y_{(t-1)n+i}^{(\mathrm{b})} = z_{(t-1)n+i}^{(\mathrm{b})}$ (this includes all slots $\{t : t \neq t_{\mathrm{A}}\}$, and slot t_{A} when Alice does not transmit).

Similarly, Willie observes $\mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{w}} = \{\mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{w}}(t)\}_{t=1}^{T(n)}$ where $\mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{w}}(t) = [y^{(\mathrm{w})}_{(t-1)n+1}, \ldots, y^{(\mathrm{w})}_{tn}]$ is a vector of observations collected during slot t. The AWGN on Willie's channel is described by an i.i.d. sequence $\{z_i^{(\mathrm{w})}\}_{i=1}^{nT(n)}$ of $nT(n)$ zero-mean Gaussian random variables with variance σ_{w}^2 (i.e., $z_i^{(\mathrm{w})} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2)$). If Alice transmits during slot t_{A}, $y^{(\mathrm{w})}_{(t_{\mathrm{A}}-1)n+i} = f_i + z^{(\mathrm{w})}_{(t_{\mathrm{A}}-1)n+i}$. For any slot that is not used for transmission, $y^{(\mathrm{w})}_{(t-1)n+i} = z^{(\mathrm{w})}_{(t-1)n+i}$ (again, this includes all slots $\{t : t \neq t_{\mathrm{A}}\}$, and slot t_{A} when Alice does not transmit). Willie does not know t_{A} and has to perform a statistical hypothesis test on his entire set of observations $\mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{w}}$ to determine whether Alice is transmitting.

B. Hypothesis Testing

Willie performs a statistical hypothesis test [16] on $\mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{w}}$, where the null hypothesis H_0 is that Alice does not transmit and each sample is an i.i.d. realization of AWGN $y_i^{(\mathrm{w})} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2)$. The alternate hypothesis H_1 is that Alice transmits, and the samples from one of the slots come from a different distribution. The rejection of H_0 when it is true is a false alarm (FA) and the acceptance of H_0 when it is false is a missed detection (MD). The probability of error $\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{e}}^{(\mathrm{w})}$ is the sum of these error probabilities weighted by the prior probabilities of the hypotheses. We assume that the prior probabilities $\mathbb{P}(H_0 \text{ true}) = \mathbb{P}(H_1 \text{ true}) = \frac{1}{2}$, and note that unequal priors do not affect our scaling results [3, Sec. V.B]. Thus, $\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{e}}^{(\mathrm{w})} = \frac{\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{FA}} + \mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{MD}}}{2}$.

As in [3], Alice desires to ensure that any detector Willie employs can only be slightly better than a random guess of her transmission state. Since a random guess results in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{e}}^{(\mathrm{w})} = \frac{1}{2}$, formally, Alice has to maintain $\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{e}}^{(\mathrm{w})} \geq \frac{1}{2} - \epsilon$ for an arbitrary choice of $\epsilon > 0$. This requirement also has a natural signal processing interpretation via the receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve [17, Ch. 2.2.2], which plots probability of detection $1 - \mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{MD}}$ versus $\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{FA}}$. Since $1 - \mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{MD}} \geq \mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{FA}}$, $\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{e}}^{(\mathrm{w})} \geq \frac{1}{2} - \epsilon$ implies that the ROC curve lies arbitrarily close to the line of no-discrimination (the diagonal line where $1 - \mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{MD}} = \mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{FA}}$). We discuss how to achieve this next.

III. ACHIEVABILITY

We proved the achievability theorems in [2], [3] by upper-bounding the relative entropy[2] between the distributions of Willie's sequence of observations $\mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{w}}$ corresponding to hypotheses H_0 and H_1. However, these bounds lack the necessary tightness in this context. Therefore, we take a different approach by explicitly analyzing Willie's optimal detector assuming that his only unknowns are:

a) slot t_{A} used by Alice for transmission (if she transmits), as depicted in Figures 1 and 2; and
b) a secret shared between Alice and Bob prior to the potential transmission.

Thus, Willie is given Alice's channel input distribution, the distribution of the AWGN on the channel between Alice and Willie, and the slot boundaries depicted on Figure 1. This effectively provides Willie with the complete statistical model of observations $\mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{w}}$ under both hypotheses H_0 and H_1, allowing him to construct an optimal detector. Here we determine what it takes for Alice to ensure that Willie's optimal detector performs only slightly better than a random guess of her transmission state, and how much data she can reliably transmit to Bob in this manner.

The optimal detector for Willie is the likelihood ratio test (LRT). This follows from the Neyman–Pearson lemma [16, Chapters 3.2 and 13.1], and the fact that Alice's transmission state is binary (implying that H_0 and H_1 are simple). The LRT compares the likelihood ratio $\Lambda(\mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{w}}) = \frac{f_1(\mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{w}})}{f_0(\mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{w}})}$ to a threshold $\tau(n)$, where $f_0(\mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{w}})$ and $f_1(\mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{w}})$ are the likelihood functions under H_0 and H_1, respectively. H_0 or H_1 is chosen based on whether $\Lambda(\mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{w}})$ is smaller or larger than $\tau(n)$ (if it is equal, a random decision is made):

$$\Lambda(\mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{w}}) \underset{H_1}{\overset{H_0}{\lessgtr}} \tau(n). \tag{1}$$

The LRT statistic $\Lambda(\mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{w}})$ is a function of the sequence of observations $\mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{w}}$, and, as such, is a random variable. Per its definition in Section II, $\mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{w}}$ is parameterized by the slot length n and

[2]Relative entropy is also known as Kullback-Liebler (KL) divergence; see [18, Chapter 10] for the discussion of its relationship to statistical hypothesis testing.

which hypothesis is true (that is, Alice's transmission state). Let $\Lambda_s^{(n)} \equiv \Lambda(\mathbf{y}_{\rm w})$ where $s \in \{0,1\}$ indicates the true hypothesis (H_0 or H_1). Since one-to-one transformations of both sides in (1) do not affect the performance of the test, we analyze a detector that is equivalent to the one defined in (1) but employs the following test statistic:

$$L_s^{(n)} \equiv g_n\left(\Lambda_s^{(n)}\right), \tag{2}$$

where $g_n(x)$ is a one-to-one function defined later. Denote by $K^{(n)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}} Q$ and $K^{(n)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} Q$ convergence of random variable $K^{(n)}$ to random variable Q in probability and in distribution, respectively. The following lemma establishes sufficient conditions for covertness of Alice's transmission:

Lemma 1. *If LRT statistic is described by random variables*

$$L_0^{(n)} = S^{(n)} + V_0^{(n)} \text{ when } H_0 \text{ is true} \tag{3}$$

$$L_1^{(n)} = S^{(n)} + V_1^{(n)} \text{ when } H_1 \text{ is true}, \tag{4}$$

where $V_0^{(n)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}} 0$ and $V_1^{(n)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}} 0$, as well as $S^{(n)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} Z$ with $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$, then $\mathbb{P}_{\rm e}^{(\rm w)} \geq \frac{1}{2} - \epsilon$ for any $\epsilon > 0$ and a sufficiently large n.

Proof: Consider any $\epsilon > 0$. Suppose Willie chooses threshold $\tau(n)$ arbitrarily. When $|V_0^{(n)}| < \delta$, the false alarm probability is lower-bounded as follows:

$$\mathbb{P}(L_0^{(n)} > \tau(n) | H_0 \text{ is true}) \geq \mathbb{P}\left(S^{(n)} \geq \tau(n) + \delta | H_0 \text{ is true}\right). \tag{5}$$

Similarly, when $|V_1^{(n)}| < \delta$, the probability of missed detection is lower-bounded as follows:

$$\mathbb{P}(L_1^{(n)} \leq \tau(n) | H_1 \text{ is true}) \geq \mathbb{P}\left(S^{(n)} \leq \tau(n) - \delta | H_1 \text{ is true}\right), \tag{6}$$

Denote by $E_{\rm C}(\tau(n), \delta)$ the event that either $S^{(n)} \geq \tau(n)+\delta$ when Alice is quiet or $S^{(n)} \leq \tau(n)-\delta$ when Alice transmits. Since we assume equiprobable priors,

$$\mathbb{P}(E_{\rm C}(\tau(n), \delta)) = \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(S^{(n)} \geq \tau(n) + \delta | H_0 \text{ is true}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(S^{(n)} \leq \tau(n) - \delta | H_1 \text{ is true}\right)}{2}. \tag{7}$$

While $S^{(n)}$ converges in distribution to $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$, this only ensures pointwise convergence in the argument of the distribution function (that is, the distribution function $F_{S^{(n)}}(z)$ of $S^{(n)}$ converges pointwise rather than uniformly in z to the distribution $\Phi(z)$ of $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$). However, since $\tau(n)$ is the n^{th} value in an arbitrary sequence, in Appendix A we exploit the uniform convergence on any finite number of points and the monotonicity of the distribution function to show that setting $\delta = \epsilon\sqrt{2\pi}/9$ yields n_0 such that for all $n \geq n_0$ and any $\tau(n)$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(E_{\mathrm{C}}\left(\tau(n), \frac{\epsilon\sqrt{2\pi}}{9}\right)\right) \geq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\epsilon}{3}. \tag{8}$$

Since $V_0^{(n)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}} 0$ and $V_1^{(n)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}} 0$, there exists $n_1 > 0$ such that for all $n \geq n_1$, $\mathbb{P}\left(|V_0^{(n)}| > \frac{\epsilon\sqrt{2\pi}}{9}\right) < \frac{\epsilon}{3}$ and $\mathbb{P}\left(|V_0^{(n)}| > \frac{\epsilon\sqrt{2\pi}}{9}\right) < \frac{\epsilon}{3}$. The intersection of these events and the event $E_{\mathrm{C}}(S(n), \epsilon\sqrt{2\pi}/9)$ yields a detection error event. By combining their probabilities using DeMorgan's Law and the union bound, we lower-bound $\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{e}}^{(\mathrm{w})} \geq \frac{1}{2} - \epsilon$ for all $n \geq \max\{n_0, n_1\}$. ■

Remark: Lemma 1 holds when $S^{(n)}$ converges to any distribution provided it has a continuous density, however, here we do not need such generality.

In order to employ Lemma 1, we require a one-to-one function $g_n(x)$ that re-scales $\Lambda_s^{(n)}$ so that the convergence conditions hold. In the proofs that follow, $\Lambda_s^{(n)} = \frac{1}{T(n)} \sum_{t=1}^{T(n)} U_t^{(n)}$, where $\{U_t^{(n)}\}_{t=1}^{T(n)}$ is a sequence of $T(n)$ independent random variables, each corresponding to a slot of length n. Since Alice is limited to slot t_{A} for a potential transmission, the only random variable in $\{U_t^{(n)}\}_{t=1}^{T(n)}$ that is distributed differently under each hypothesis is $U_{t_{\mathrm{A}}}^{(n)}$. We thus denote by $U_{t_{\mathrm{A}}}^{(n,0)}$ and $U_{t_{\mathrm{A}}}^{(n,1)}$ the random variable corresponding to slot t_{A} under H_0 and H_1, respectively. Regardless of Alice's transmission state, $\{U_t^{(n)}\}_{\substack{t=1 \\ t\neq t_{\mathrm{A}}}}^{T(n)}$ is an i.i.d. sequence, with $U_{t_{\mathrm{A}}}^{(n,0)}$ distributed identically to the elements of $\{U_t^{(n)}\}_{\substack{t=1 \\ t\neq t_{\mathrm{A}}}}^{T(n)}$. Therefore,

$$\Lambda_s^{(n)} = \frac{1}{T(n)} \sum_{\substack{t=1 \\ t\neq t_{\mathrm{A}}}}^{T(n)} U_t^{(n)} + \frac{U_{t_{\mathrm{A}}}^{(n,s)}}{T(n)}, \quad s \in \{0,1\}. \tag{9}$$

Let's denote by $\mu_U(n)$ and $\sigma_U^2(n)$ respectively the mean and variance of $U_{t_\mathrm{A}}^{(n,0)}$ and $U_t^{(n)}$, $t \neq t_\mathrm{A}$. We define $g_n(x)$ as follows:

$$g_n(x) = \frac{(x - (T(n)-1)\mu_U(n))T(n)}{\sigma_U(n)\sqrt{T(n)-1}}. \tag{10}$$

Thus, the re-scaled test statistic $L_s^{(n)}$, $s \in \{0,1\}$, is expressed as follows:

$$L_0^{(n)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T(n)-1}} \sum_{\substack{t=1 \\ t\neq t_\mathrm{A}}}^{T(n)} \frac{U_t^{(n)} - \mu_U(n)}{\sigma_U(n)} + \frac{U_{t_\mathrm{A}}^{(n,0)}}{\sigma_U(n)\sqrt{T(n)-1}} \text{ when } H_0 \text{ is true} \tag{11}$$

$$L_1^{(n)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T(n)-1}} \sum_{\substack{t=1 \\ t\neq t_\mathrm{A}}}^{T(n)} \frac{U_t^{(n)} - \mu_U(n)}{\sigma_U(n)} + \frac{U_{t_\mathrm{A}}^{(n,1)}}{\sigma_U(n)\sqrt{T(n)-1}} \text{ when } H_1 \text{ is true}, \tag{12}$$

By the central limit theorem (CLT) for triangular arrays [19, Th. 27.2], $\frac{1}{\sqrt{T(n)-1}} \sum_{\substack{t=1 \\ t\neq t_\mathrm{A}}}^{T(n)} \frac{U_t^{(n)} - \mu_U(n)}{\sigma_U(n)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} Z$ where $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$. Thus, the weighted sum in (11) and (12) corresponds to $S^{(n)}$ in Lemma 1. Now consider the term corresponding to slot t_A, $\frac{U_{t_\mathrm{A}}^{(n,s)}}{\sigma_U(n)\sqrt{T(n)-1}}$. It effectively offsets Z's mean away from zero and its distribution depends on Alice's transmission state s. Thus, depending on which hypothesis is true, it maps to either $V_0^{(n)}$ or $V_1^{(n)}$ in Lemma 1. To prove achievability of covert communication, we show that there exists a coding scheme for Alice such that the random variable describing the LRT statistic has the form given in (11) and (12), with the terms in the sums satisfying the regularity conditions required by the CLT and the term corresponding to slot t_A converging to zero in probability. This allows us to establish the covertness of Alice's transmission by applying Lemma 1. We prove reliability by extending the random coding arguments from [2], [3].

First, we state an achievability theorem under an average power constraint.

Theorem 1.1 (Achievability)**.** *Suppose Alice has a slotted AWGN channel to Bob with $T(n) = \omega(1)$ slots, each containing n symbol periods. Then, provided that Alice and Bob have a secret of sufficient length, if Alice chooses to, she can transmit $\mathcal{O}\left(\min\{\sqrt{n \log T(n)}, n\}\right)$ bits in a single slot while $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}_\mathrm{e}^{(\mathrm{w})} > \frac{1}{2} - \epsilon$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}_\mathrm{e}^{(\mathrm{b})} \leq \delta$ for arbitrary $\epsilon > 0$ and $\delta > 0$.*

Proof: **Construction:** Alice secretly selects slot $t_{\rm A}$ uniformly at random out of the $T(n)$ slots. Alice's channel encoder takes as input blocks of length M bits and encodes them into codewords of length n symbols. We employ random coding arguments and independently generate 2^M codewords $\{\mathbf{c}(W_k), k = 1, 2, \ldots, 2^M\}$ from $\mathbb{R}^n$ for messages $\{W_k\}_{k=1}^{2^M}$, each according to $p_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} p_X(x_i)$, where $X \sim \mathcal{N}(0, P_{\rm f})$ and symbol power $P_{\rm f} < \frac{\sigma_{\rm w}^2}{2}$ is defined later. The codebook[3] is used only to send a single message and, along with $t_{\rm A}$, is the secret not revealed to Willie, though he knows how it is constructed, including the value $P_{\rm f}$.

Analysis (Willie): Denote by $Y_t = \sum_{y_i \in \mathbf{y}_{\rm w}(t)} y_i^2$ the power in slot t. Since Willie's channel from Alice is corrupted by AWGN with power $\sigma_{\rm w}^2$, the likelihood function of the observations $\mathbf{y}_{\rm w}$ under H_0 is:

$$f_0(\mathbf{y}_{\rm w}) = \left(\frac{1}{2\pi\sigma_{\rm w}^2}\right)^{\frac{nT(n)}{2}} \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2\sigma_{\rm w}^2}\sum_{t=1}^{T(n)} Y_t\right]. \tag{13}$$

Since Willie does not know which of the $T(n)$ slots Alice randomly selects for communication, nor the codebook Alice and Bob use, but knows that Alice's signal is Gaussian, the likelihood function of the observations $\mathbf{y}_{\rm w}$ under H_1 is:

$$f_1(\mathbf{y}_{\rm w}) = \frac{1}{\sigma_{\rm w}^{(T(n)-1)n}(\sigma_{\rm w}^2 + P_{\rm f})^{\frac{n}{2}}(2\pi)^{\frac{nT(n)}{2}}T(n)} \sum_{t=1}^{T(n)} \exp\left[-\frac{Y_t}{2(\sigma_{\rm w}^2 + P_{\rm f})} - \frac{1}{2\sigma_{\rm w}^2}\sum_{\substack{r=1 \\ r\neq t}}^{T(n)} Y_r\right]. \tag{14}$$

The LRT statistic $\Lambda_s^{(n)}$ is the ratio between (13) and (14). Re-arranging terms yields:

$$\Lambda_s^{(n)} = \frac{1}{T(n)}\sum_{t=1}^{T(n)}\left(\frac{\sigma_{\rm w}^2}{\sigma_{\rm w}^2 + P_{\rm f}}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}} \exp\left[\frac{P_{\rm f} Y_t}{2\sigma_{\rm w}^2(\sigma_{\rm w}^2 + P_{\rm f})}\right]. \tag{15}$$

When Alice does not transmit in the $i^{\rm th}$ symbol period, $y_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{\rm w}^2)$ since Willie observes AWGN; when Alice transmits, $y_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{\rm w}^2 + P_{\rm f})$ by construction. Let $\{X_t\}$, $X_t \sim \chi_n^2$,

[3]Another way of viewing the construction is as a choice of one of $T(n)$ codebooks, where the $i^{\rm th}$ codebook has a block of non-zero symbols in the $i^{\rm th}$ slot. Selection of the $t_{\rm A}$-th slot is equivalent to selection of the $t_{\rm A}$-th codebook and the message is encoded by choosing a codeword from the selected codebook.

$t = 1, \ldots, T(n)$ be a sequence of i.i.d. chi-squared random variables with n degrees of freedom. Then $Y_t = \sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2 X_t$ for all $t \in \{1, \ldots, T(n)\}$ under H_0 and $t \in \{1, \ldots, T(n)\} \setminus \{t_{\mathrm{A}}\}$ under H_1, while $Y_{t_{\mathrm{A}}} = (\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2 + P_{\mathrm{f}}) X_{t_{\mathrm{A}}}$ under H_1. Let $U_t^{(n)} = \left(\frac{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2}{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2 + P_{\mathrm{f}}}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}} \exp\left[\frac{P_{\mathrm{f}} X_t}{2(\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2 + P_{\mathrm{f}})}\right]$ for all $t \in \{1, \ldots, T(n)\} \setminus \{t_{\mathrm{A}}\}$, $U_{t_{\mathrm{A}}}^{(n,0)} = \left(\frac{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2}{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2 + P_{\mathrm{f}}}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}} \exp\left[\frac{P_{\mathrm{f}} X_t}{2(\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2 + P_{\mathrm{f}})}\right]$, and $U_{t_{\mathrm{A}}}^{(n,1)} = \left(\frac{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2}{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2 + P_{\mathrm{f}}}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}} \exp\left[\frac{P_{\mathrm{f}} X_t}{2\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2}\right]$. Application of $g_n(x)$ in (10) to (15) yields the expression for $L_s^{(n)}$ in the form defined in (11) and (12).

Using the moment generating function (MGF) $\mathcal{M}_{\chi_n^2}(x) = (1 - 2x)^{-n/2}$ of a chi-squared random variable, we have:

$$\mu_U(n) = \left(\frac{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2}{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2 + P_{\mathrm{f}}}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}} \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\frac{P_{\mathrm{f}} X_t}{2(\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2 + P_{\mathrm{f}})}\right)\right] = 1 \tag{16}$$

$$\sigma_U^2(n) = \left(\frac{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2}{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2 + P_{\mathrm{f}}}\right)^{n} \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\frac{P_{\mathrm{f}} X_t}{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2 + P_{\mathrm{f}}}\right)\right] - 1 = \left(\frac{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^4}{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^4 - P_{\mathrm{f}}^2}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}} - 1. \tag{17}$$

Since $P_{\mathrm{f}} < \frac{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2}{2}$, $\mu_U(n)$ and $\sigma_U^2(n)$ satisfy conditions for the CLT [19, Th. 27.2] and $\frac{1}{\sqrt{T(n)-1}} \sum_{\substack{t=1 \\ t \neq t_{\mathrm{A}}}}^{T(n)} \frac{U_t^{(n)} - \mu_U(n)}{\sigma_U(n)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} Z$, $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$. Also, when Alice does not transmit, by Chebyshev's inequality:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{U_{t_{\mathrm{A}}}^{(n,0)}}{\sigma_U(n)\sqrt{T(n)-1}}\right| > \delta\right) \leq \frac{\sigma_U^2(n)}{(\delta \sigma_U(n)\sqrt{T(n)-1} - 1)^2}. \tag{18}$$

Since $T(n) = \omega(1)$ and $P_{\mathrm{f}} < \frac{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2}{2}$, $\frac{U_{t_{\mathrm{A}}}^{(n,0)}}{\sigma_U(n)\sqrt{T(n)-1}} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}} 0$ as $n \to \infty$.

When Alice transmits,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[U_{t_{\mathrm{A}}}^{(n,1)}\right] = \left(\frac{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2}{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2 + P_{\mathrm{f}}}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}} \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\frac{P_{\mathrm{f}} X_t}{2\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2}\right)\right] = \left(\frac{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^4}{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^4 - P_{\mathrm{f}}^2}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}} \tag{19}$$

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(U_{t_{\mathrm{A}}}^{(n,1)}\right)^2\right] = \left(\frac{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2}{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2 + P_{\mathrm{f}}}\right)^{n} \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\frac{P_{\mathrm{f}} X_t}{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2}\right)\right] = \left(\frac{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2}{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2 + P_{\mathrm{f}}}\right)^{n} \left(\frac{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2}{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2 - 2P_{\mathrm{f}}}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}}. \tag{20}$$

By Chebyshev's inequality:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{U_{t_{\mathrm{A}}}^{(n,1)}}{\sigma_U(n)\sqrt{T(n)-1}}\right| > \delta\right) \leq \frac{\mathrm{Var}\left[U_{t_{\mathrm{A}}}^{(n,1)}\right]}{\left(\delta \sigma_U(n)\sqrt{T(n)-1} - \mathbb{E}\left[U_{t_{\mathrm{A}}}^{(n,1)}\right]\right)^2}. \tag{21}$$

Let's divide the numerator and the denominator in the RHS of (21) by $\mathrm{Var}\left[U_{t_\mathrm{A}}^{(n,1)}\right]$. First, note that:

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}\left[U_{t_\mathrm{A}}^{(n,1)}\right]}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}\left[U_{t_\mathrm{A}}^{(n,1)}\right]}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\left(1+\frac{P_\mathrm{f}^2}{\sigma_\mathrm{w}^4(1-2P_\mathrm{f}/\sigma_\mathrm{w}^2)}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}}-1}} \tag{22}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{\left(1+\frac{P_\mathrm{f}^2}{\sigma_\mathrm{w}^4(1-2P_\mathrm{f}/\sigma_\mathrm{w}^2)}\right)^{\frac{n}{4}}} \leq 1, \tag{23}$$

where the second inequality in (23) follows from $\sigma_\mathrm{w}^2 > 0$ and P_f satisfying $0 \leq P_\mathrm{f} < \frac{\sigma_\mathrm{w}^2}{2}$. Also, $\frac{\sigma_U^2(n)}{\mathrm{Var}\left[U_{t_\mathrm{A}}^{(n,1)}\right]} \geq \frac{\sigma_U^2(n)}{\mathbb{E}\left[\left(U_{t_\mathrm{A}}^{(n,1)}\right)^2\right]}$ where $\frac{\sigma_U^2(n)}{\mathbb{E}\left[\left(U_{t_\mathrm{A}}^{(n,1)}\right)^2\right]} = \left(1-\frac{2P_\mathrm{f}^2}{\sigma_\mathrm{w}^4(1-P_\mathrm{f}/\sigma_\mathrm{w}^2)}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}} - o(1)$. When $T(n) = o(e^n)$, setting $P_\mathrm{f} = \frac{c_\mathrm{P}\sigma_\mathrm{w}^2\sqrt{\log T(n)}}{\sqrt{n}}$ for a constant $c_\mathrm{P} \in (0,1)$ ensures $\frac{U_{t_\mathrm{A}}^{(n,1)}}{\sigma_U(n)\sqrt{T(n)-1}} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}} 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Convergence follows from noting that $\left(1-\frac{2P_\mathrm{f}^2}{\sigma_\mathrm{w}^4(1-P_\mathrm{f}/\sigma_\mathrm{w}^2)}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}} = \exp\left[\frac{n}{2}\log\left(1-\frac{2P_\mathrm{f}^2}{\sigma_\mathrm{w}^4(1-P_\mathrm{f}/\sigma_\mathrm{w}^2)}\right)\right]$, and using the Taylor series expansion of $\log(1-x)$ at $x=0$. When $T(n) = \Omega(e^n)$, convergence is obtained by setting $P_\mathrm{f} = \frac{c_\mathrm{P}\sigma_\mathrm{w}^2}{2}$. Therefore, by Lemma 1, setting $P_\mathrm{f} = c_\mathrm{P}\sigma_\mathrm{w}^2 \min\left\{\frac{\sqrt{\log T(n)}}{\sqrt{n}}, \frac{1}{2}\right\}$ ensures $\mathbb{P}_\mathrm{e}^{(\mathrm{w})} \geq \frac{1}{2} - \epsilon$ for any $\epsilon > 0$.

Analysis (Bob): Let Bob employ the maximum likelihood (ML) decoder (i.e., minimum distance decoder). If Bob knows the value of t_A, since $P_\mathrm{f} = c_\mathrm{P}\sigma_\mathrm{w}^2 \min\{\frac{\sqrt{\log T(n)}}{\sqrt{n}}, \frac{1}{2}\}$, Alice can reliably (i.e., with Bob's decoding error probability, averaged over all the codebooks, decaying to zero as $n \to \infty$) transmit $M = \frac{n\gamma}{2}\log_2\left(1+\frac{c_\mathrm{P}\sigma_\mathrm{w}^2}{2\sigma_\mathrm{b}^2}\min\left\{\frac{\sqrt{\log T(n)}}{\sqrt{n}}, \frac{1}{2}\right\}\right)$ covert bits, where $\gamma \in (0,1)$ is a constant [2], [3]. However, knowledge of t_A is unnecessary for Bob if $T(n) < 2^{c_\mathrm{T} n}$, where $c_\mathrm{T} > 0$ is a constant. Let's augment Alice and Bob's Gaussian codebook with the origin $\mathbf{c}(0) = \{0, \ldots, 0\}$ (indicating "no transmission") and have Bob attempt to decode each of the $T(n)$ slots. The squared distance between a codeword $\mathbf{c}(W_k)$ and $\mathbf{c}(0)$ is $P_\mathrm{f}X$, where $X \sim \chi_n^2$. Repeating the analysis of Bob's detection error probability from [2], [3] using the distance between $\mathbf{c}(W_k)$ and $\mathbf{c}(0)$ instead of $\mathbf{c}(W_i)$ yields a looser upper bound on the probability of the decoding error in each slot. By the union bound over all $T(n)$ slots, the overall probability of error is $\mathbb{P}_\mathrm{e}^{(\mathrm{b})} \leq T(n)2^{M-\frac{n}{2}\log_2\left(1+\frac{P_\mathrm{f}}{4\sigma_\mathrm{b}^2}\right)}$. If $T(n) = o(e^n)$, then clearly Bob's decoding error

probability decays to zero if Alice attempts to transmit $M = \frac{n\gamma}{2}\log_2\left(1 + \frac{c_{\rm P}\sigma_{\rm w}^2\sqrt{\log T(n)}}{4\sigma_{\rm b}^2\sqrt{n}}\right)$ bits in a randomly selected n-symbol slot $t_{\rm A}$. If $T(n) = \Omega(e^n)$, then, $P_{\rm f} = \frac{\sigma_{\rm w}^2}{2}$, and $T(n) < 2^{c_{\rm T}n}$ where $c_{\rm T} = \frac{1-\gamma}{2}\log_2\left(1 + \frac{c_{\rm P}\sigma_{\rm w}^2}{8\sigma_{\rm b}^2}\right)$ ensures that Bob's decoding error probability decays to zero if Alice attempts to transmit $M = \frac{n\gamma}{2}\log_2\left(1 + \frac{c_{\rm P}\sigma_{\rm w}^2}{8\sigma_{\rm b}^2}\right)$ bits in a randomly selected n-symbol slot $t_{\rm A}$. Therefore, $\mathcal{O}(\min\{\sqrt{n\log T(n)}, n\})$ covert bits can be transmitted reliably using slot $t_{\rm A}$. ■

Unfortunately, representing real-valued codewords requires unbounded storage, which means that the length of the secret pre-shared by Alice and Bob is infinite. To address this, we consider finite alphabet input, which also satisfies a peak power constraint on the transmitter. The remark in [3, Section III] allows both improvement of Bob's decoding performance and reduction of the size of the pre-shared secret to $\mathcal{O}(n)$ bits (provided $T(n) < 2^{c_{\rm T}n}$).[4]

Theorem 1.2 (Achievability under peak power constraint)**.** *Suppose Alice has a slotted AWGN channel to Bob with $T(n) = \omega(1)$ slots, each containing n symbol periods, and that her transmitter is subject to the peak power constraint $P_{\max} \in (0, \infty)$. Then, provided that Alice and Bob have a secret of sufficient length, if Alice chooses to, she can transmit $\mathcal{O}\left(\min\{\sqrt{n\log T(n)}, n\}\right)$ bits in a single slot while $\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{P}_{\rm e}^{\rm (w)} > \frac{1}{2} - \epsilon$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{P}_{\rm e}^{\rm (b)} \leq \delta$ for any $\epsilon > 0$ and $\delta > 0$.*

Proof: **Construction:** Alice secretly selects slot $t_{\rm A}$ uniformly at random out of the $T(n)$ slots in which to communicate. She encodes the input in blocks of length M bits into codewords of length n bits/symbol with the symbols drawn from alphabet $\{-a, a\}$, where a satisfies the peak power constraint $a^2 < P_{\max}$ and is defined later. Alice independently generates 2^M codewords $\{\mathbf{c}(W_k), k = 1, 2, \ldots, 2^M\}$ for messages $\{W_k\}$ from $\{-a, a\}^n$ according to $p_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i=1}^n p_X(x_i)$, where $p_X(-a) = p_X(a) = \frac{1}{2}$. As in the proof of Theorem 1.1, this single-use codebook is not revealed to Willie, though he knows how it is constructed, including the value of a. While in this proof the entire codebook is secretly shared between Alice and Bob, the

[4]We believe that the pre-shared secret can be reduced to $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n}\log n)$ bits using a protocol described in [3, Appendix] and, possibly, to $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n})$ bits using resolvability-based approach in [5]. However, this is outside of the scope of this work.

amount of shared secret information can be reduced using the remark in [3, Section III].

Analysis (Willie): The model for the AWGN channel from Alice to Willie did not change from Theorem 1.1, implying that the likelihood function of the observations $\mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{w}}$ under H_0 is given by (13). Since Willie does not know which of the $T(n)$ slots Alice randomly selects for communication, nor the codebook Alice and Bob use, but knows how the codebook is constructed, the likelihood function of the observations $\mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{w}}$ under H_1 is:

$$f_1(\mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{w}}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2)^{\frac{nT(n)}{2}} T(n)} \sum_{t=1}^{T(n)} \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\{-1,1\}^n} \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2} \left(\sum_{\substack{r=1 \\ r\neq t}}^{T(n)} Y_r + \sum_{y_i \in \mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{w}}(t)} (y_i - a b_i)^2 \right) \right]. \tag{24}$$

The LRT statistic $\Lambda_s^{(n)}$ is the ratio between (13) and (24). Re-arranging terms yields:

$$\Lambda_s^{(n)} = \frac{1}{T(n)} \sum_{t=1}^{T(n)} \frac{\exp\left[-\frac{na^2}{2\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2}\right]}{2^n} \sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\{-1,1\}^n} \exp\left[\frac{a}{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2} \sum_{y_i \in \mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{w}}(t)} y_i b_i \right]. \tag{25}$$

Let $U_t^{(n)} = \frac{\exp\left[-\frac{na^2}{2\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2}\right]}{2^n} \sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\{-1,1\}^n} \exp\left[\frac{a}{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2} \sum_{y_i \in \mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{w}}(t)} y_i b_i\right]$. Application of $g_n(x)$ in (10) to (25) yields the expression for $L_s^{(n)}$ in the form defined in (11) and (12).

When Alice does not transmit, $\exp\left[\frac{a}{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2} \sum_{y_i \in \mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{w}}(t)} y_i b_i\right] \sim \log\mathcal{N}\left(0, \frac{na^2}{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2}\right)$, where $\log\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ denotes the log-normal distribution with location μ and scale σ^2. Thus,

$$\mu_U(n) = \frac{\exp\left[-\frac{na^2}{2\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2}\right]}{2^n} \sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\{-1,1\}^n} \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left[\frac{a}{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2} \sum_{y_i \in \mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{w}}(t)} y_i b_i \right] \right] = 1 \tag{26}$$

To obtain $\sigma_U^2(n)$, we calculate the second moment of $U_{t_{\mathrm{A}}}^{(n,0)}$ and $U_t^{(n)}$, $t \neq t_{\mathrm{A}}$:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(U_t^{(n)}\right)^2\right] = \frac{\exp\left[-\frac{na^2}{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2}\right]}{2^{2n}} \sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\{-1,1\}^n} \sum_{\mathbf{d}\in\{-1,1\}^n} \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left[\frac{a}{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2} \sum_{y_i \in \mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{w}}(t)} y_i (b_i + d_i) \right] \right] \tag{27}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2^{2n}} \sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\{-1,1\}^n} \sum_{\mathbf{d}\in\{-1,1\}^n} \exp\left[\frac{a^2}{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i d_i \right] \tag{28}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2^{2n}} \sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\{-1,1\}^n} \sum_{\mathbf{z}\in\{-1,1\}^n} \exp\left[\frac{a^2}{\sigma_{\rm w}^2}\sum_{i=1}^{n} z_i\right] \tag{29}$$

$$= \cosh^n\left(\frac{a^2}{\sigma_{\rm w}^2}\right), \tag{30}$$

where (28) follows from $\exp\left[\frac{a}{\sigma_{\rm w}^2}\sum_{y_i\in\mathbf{y}_{\rm w}(t)} y_i(b_i+d_i)\right] \sim \log\mathcal{N}\left(0, \frac{a^2}{\sigma_{\rm w}^2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(b_i+d_i)^2\right)$; (29) is because for a given $\mathbf{b}\in\{-1,1\}^n$ and any $\mathbf{d}\in\{-1,1\}^n$, $\mathbf{z} = [b_1d_1, b_2d_2, \ldots, b_nd_n]$ is a unique vector in $\{-1,1\}^n$; and, (30) follows from Appendix B. Thus, $\frac{1}{\sqrt{T(n)-1}}\sum_{\substack{t=1\\ t\neq t_{\rm A}}}^{T(n)} \frac{U_t^{(n)}-\mu_U(n)}{\sigma_U(n)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} Z$, $Z\sim\mathcal{N}(0,1)$. Also, when Alice does not transmit, by Chebyshev's inequality:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{U_{t_{\rm A}}^{(n,0)}}{\sigma_U(n)\sqrt{T(n)-1}}\right| > \delta\right) \leq \frac{\sigma_U^2(n)}{(\delta\sigma_U(n)\sqrt{T(n)-1}-1)^2}. \tag{31}$$

Since $T(n)=\omega(1)$, $\frac{U_{t_{\rm A}}^{(n,0)}}{\sigma_U(n)\sqrt{T(n)-1}} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}} 0$ as $n\to\infty$.

When Alice transmits, by construction, Willie observes $y_{(t_{\rm A}-1)n+i} \sim \mathcal{N}(ac_i, \sigma_{\rm w}^2)$, $i=1,\ldots,n$, where $\mathbf{c}=[c_1,\ldots,c_n]$ is drawn equiprobably from $\{-1,1\}^n$. Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[U_{t_{\rm A}}^{(n,1)}\right] = \frac{\exp\left[-\frac{na^2}{2\sigma_{\rm w}^2}\right]}{2^{2n}} \sum_{\mathbf{c}\in\{-1,1\}^n}\sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\{-1,1\}^n} \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left[\frac{a}{\sigma_{\rm w}^2}\sum_{y_i\in\mathbf{y}_{\rm w}(t)} y_ib_i\right]\right] \tag{32}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2^{2n}} \sum_{\mathbf{c}\in\{-1,1\}^n}\sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\{-1,1\}^n} \exp\left[\frac{a^2}{\sigma_{\rm w}^2}\sum_{i=1}^{n} b_ic_i\right] = \cosh^n\left(\frac{a^2}{\sigma_{\rm w}^2}\right), \tag{33}$$

where (33) follows from $\exp\left[\frac{a}{\sigma_{\rm w}^2}\sum_{y_i\in\mathbf{y}_{\rm w}(t)} y_ib_i\right] \sim \log\mathcal{N}\left(\frac{a^2}{\sigma_{\rm w}^2}\sum_{i=1}^{n} c_ib_i, \frac{na^2}{\sigma_{\rm w}^2}\right)$, the argument for (29) above, and Appendix B. By the definition of variance and the law of total expectation, $\mathrm{Var}[U_{t_{\rm A}}^{(n,1)}] \leq \frac{1}{2^n}\sum_{\mathbf{c}\in\{-1,1\}^n} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(U_{t_{\rm A}}^{(n,1)}|\mathbf{c}\text{ sent}\right)^2\right]$, where

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(U_{t_{\rm A}}^{(n,1)}|\mathbf{c}\text{ sent}\right)^2\right] = \frac{\exp\left[-\frac{na^2}{\sigma_{\rm w}^2}\right]}{2^{2n}} \sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\{-1,1\}^n}\sum_{\mathbf{d}\in\{-1,1\}^n} \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left[\frac{a}{\sigma_{\rm w}^2}\sum_{y_i\in\mathbf{y}_{\rm w}(t)} y_i(b_i+d_i)\right]\right] \tag{34}$$

$$= \frac{\exp\left[-\frac{na^2}{\sigma_{\rm w}^2}\right]}{2^{2n}} \sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\{-1,1\}^n}\sum_{\mathbf{d}\in\{-1,1\}^n} \exp\left[\frac{a^2}{\sigma_{\rm w}^2}\sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i(b_i+d_i) + \frac{(b_i+d_i)^2}{2}\right] \tag{35}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2^{2n}} \sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\{-1,1\}^n} \sum_{\mathbf{d}\in\{-1,1\}^n} \exp\left[\frac{a^2}{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2}\sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i b_i + (c_i + b_i)d_i\right] \tag{36}$$

$$\leq \cosh^n\left(\frac{a^2}{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2}\right)\cosh^n\left(\frac{2a^2}{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2}\right), \tag{37}$$

with (37) following from $c_i + b_i \leq 2$ and arguments for (33) above. By Chebyshev's inequality:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{U_{t_{\mathrm{A}}}^{(n,1)}}{\sigma_U(n)\sqrt{T(n)-1}}\right| > \delta\right) \leq \frac{\cosh^n\left(\frac{a^2}{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2}\right)\cosh^n\left(\frac{2a^2}{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2}\right)}{\left(\delta\sigma_U(n)\sqrt{T(n)-1} - \mathbb{E}\left[U_{t_{\mathrm{A}}}^{(n,1)}\right]\right)^2}. \tag{38}$$

Dividing both numerator and denominator of (38) by $\cosh^n\left(\frac{a^2}{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2}\right)\cosh^n\left(\frac{2a^2}{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2}\right)$, we note that $\frac{\mathbb{E}\left[U_{t_{\mathrm{A}}}^{(n,1)}\right]}{\cosh^{\frac{n}{2}}\left(\frac{a^2}{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2}\right)\cosh^{\frac{n}{2}}\left(\frac{2a^2}{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2}\right)} = \left(\frac{\cosh(a^2/\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2)}{\cosh(2a^2/\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2)}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}} \leq 1$, since $\frac{\cosh(x)}{\cosh(2x)} \leq 1$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Also, $\frac{\sigma_U^2(n)}{\cosh^n\left(\frac{a^2}{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2}\right)\cosh^n\left(\frac{2a^2}{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2}\right)} = \cosh^{-n}\left(\frac{2a^2}{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2}\right)$. When $T(n) = o(e^n)$, setting $a^2 = \frac{c_{\mathrm{P}}\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2\sqrt{\log T(n)}}{\sqrt{2n}}$ for a constant $c_{\mathrm{P}} \in (0,1)$ ensures $\frac{U_{t_{\mathrm{A}}}^{(n,1)}}{\sigma_U(n)\sqrt{T(n)-1}} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}} 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Convergence follows from noting that $\cosh^{-n}\left(\frac{2a^2}{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2}\right) = \exp\left[-n\log\cosh\left(\frac{2a^2}{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2}\right)\right] \geq \exp\left[-\frac{2na^4}{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^4}\right]$. When $T(n) = \Omega(e^n)$, convergence is obtained by setting $a^2 = \frac{c_{\mathrm{P}}\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2}{2}$. Therefore, by Lemma 1, setting $a^2 = c_{\mathrm{P}}\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2\min\left\{\frac{\sqrt{\log T(n)}}{\sqrt{2n}}, \frac{1}{2}\right\}$ ensures $\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{e}}^{(\mathrm{w})} \geq \frac{1}{2} - \epsilon$ for any $\epsilon > 0$.

Analysis (Bob): Suppose Alice transmits $\mathbf{c}(W_k)$. As in the proof of Theorem 1.1, let Bob employ the ML decoder that suffers an error event $E_{k\to i}$ when the received vector $\mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{b}}$ is closer in Euclidean distance to codeword $\mathbf{c}(W_i)$, $i \neq k$. Knowledge of t_{A} allows the application of Appendix C: since $a^2 = c_{\mathrm{P}}\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2\min\left\{\frac{\sqrt{\log T(n)}}{\sqrt{2n}}, \frac{1}{2}\right\}$, Alice can ensure reliable decoding (i.e., Bob's error probability, averaged over all the codebooks, decaying to zero as $n \to \infty$) for a covert transmission containing $M = n\gamma\left(1 - \log_2\left[1 + \exp\left(-\frac{c_{\mathrm{P}}\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2}{2\sigma_{\mathrm{b}}^2}\min\left\{\frac{\sqrt{\log T(n)}}{\sqrt{2n}}, \frac{1}{2}\right\}\right)\right]\right)$ bits, where $\gamma \in (0,1)$ is a constant.

However, as in Theorem 1.1, knowledge of t_{A} is unnecessary for Bob if $T(n) < 2^{c_{\mathrm{T}}n}$ where c_{T} is a constant. Again, let's augment Alice and Bob's codebook with the origin $\mathbf{c}(0) = \{0,\ldots,0\}$ (indicating "no transmission") and have Bob attempt to decode each of the $T(n)$ slots. Denoting the decoding error probability in slot t by $\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{e}}^{(\mathrm{b})}(t)$, we employ the union bound over all slots to

upper-bound the overall decoding error probability:

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{e}}^{(\mathrm{b})} \leq \sum_{t=1}^{T(n)} \mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{e}}^{(\mathrm{b})}(t). \tag{39}$$

The decoding error probability for one of the $T(n)-1$ slots that Alice does not use is the probability that the received vector is closer to some codeword than the origin $\mathbf{c}(0)$:

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{e}}^{(\mathrm{b})}(t) = \mathbb{P}\left(\cup_{i=1}^{2^M} E_{0\to i}\right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{2^M} \mathbb{P}(E_{0\to i}), t \neq t_{\mathrm{A}}, \tag{40}$$

where the inequality is the union bound. Since the Euclidean distance between each codeword and $\mathbf{c}(0)$ is $\sqrt{n}a$, by [20, Eq. (3.44)]:

$$\mathbb{P}(E_{0\to i}) = Q\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}a}{2\sigma_{\mathrm{b}}}\right) \leq \frac{1}{2}\exp\left(-\frac{na^2}{8\sigma_{\mathrm{b}}^2}\right), \tag{41}$$

where $Q(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_x^\infty e^{-t^2/2}dt$ and the inequality is because of the upper bound $Q(x) \leq \frac{1}{2}e^{-x^2/2}$ [21, Eq. (5)]. Substituting (41) into (40) yields

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{e}}^{(\mathrm{b})}(t) \leq 2^{M-\frac{na^2\log_2 e}{8\sigma_{\mathrm{b}}^2}}, t \neq t_{\mathrm{A}}. \tag{42}$$

To upper-bound the decoding error probability for the slot that Alice uses to transmit, we combine the bounds in (42) and (64) as follows:

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{e}}^{(\mathrm{b})}(t_{\mathrm{A}}) \leq 2^{M-n\min\left\{1-\log_2\left[1+\exp\left(-\frac{a^2}{2\sigma_{\mathrm{b}}^2}\right)\right], \frac{a^2\log_2 e}{8\sigma_{\mathrm{b}}^2}\right\}}. \tag{43}$$

Combining (39), (42), and (43) yields

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{e}}^{(\mathrm{b})} \leq (T(n)-1)2^{M-\frac{na^2\log_2 e}{8\sigma_{\mathrm{b}}^2}} + 2^{M-n\min\left\{1-\log_2\left[1+\exp\left(-\frac{a^2}{2\sigma_{\mathrm{b}}^2}\right)\right], \frac{a^2\log_2 e}{8\sigma_{\mathrm{b}}^2}\right\}}. \tag{44}$$

If $T(n) = o(e^n)$, then Alice sets $a^2 = c_{\mathrm{P}}\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2\frac{\sqrt{\log T(n)}}{\sqrt{2n}}$. Thus, for large enough n, $\frac{a^2\log_2 e}{8\sigma_{\mathrm{b}}^2} < 1-\log_2\left[1+\exp\left(-\frac{a^2}{2\sigma_{\mathrm{b}}^2}\right)\right]$ and Bob's decoding error probability decays to zero if Alice attempts to transmit $M = \frac{n\gamma c_{\mathrm{P}}\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2\sqrt{n\log T(n)}\log_2 e}{8\sqrt{2}\sigma_{\mathrm{b}}^2}$ bits in a randomly selected n-symbol slot t_{A}, where $\gamma \in (0,1)$. If $T(n) = \Omega(e^n)$, then, $a^2 = \frac{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2}{2}$, and $T(n) < 2^{c_{\mathrm{T}}n}$ where $c_{\mathrm{T}} = \frac{(1-\gamma)c_{\mathrm{P}}\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2\log_2 e}{16\sigma_{\mathrm{b}}^2}$ ensures that Bob's decoding error probability decays to zero if Alice attempts to transmit $M = n\gamma\min\left\{1-\log_2\left[1+\exp\left(-\frac{\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2}{4\sigma_{\mathrm{b}}^2}\right)\right], \frac{c_{\mathrm{P}}\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2\log_2 e}{16\sigma_{\mathrm{b}}^2}\right\}$ bits in slot t_{A}. ■

IV. CONVERSE

Here we show that Alice cannot transmit $\omega(\sqrt{n \log T(n)})$ bits both reliably and covertly using one of $T(n)$ n-symbol slots. Alice attempts to send one of 2^M (equally likely) M-bit messages reliably to Bob using a sequence of n consecutive symbol periods out of $nT(n)$, where $M = \omega(\sqrt{n \log T(n)})$, and each message is encoded arbitrarily into n symbols. Unlike in the previous section, here Willie is oblivious to the locations of the slot boundaries, Alice's codebook construction scheme and other properties of her signal. Nevertheless, by dividing his sequence of $nT(n)$ observations into a set of $T(n)$ non-overlapping subsequences, and employing a simple threshold detector on the maximum subsequence power, Willie can detect Alice if she attempts to transmit $\omega(\sqrt{n \log T(n)})$ covert bits reliably. We assume that Alice is power-constrained, precluding transmission of $\omega(n)$ bits in n AWGN channel uses (see standard arguments in [18, Chapter 9]). We therefore limit our analysis to $T(n) = o(e^n)$.

Theorem 2. *If Alice attempts to transmit $\omega(\sqrt{n \log T(n)})$ bits using a sequence of n consecutive symbol periods that are arbitrarily located inside a sequence of $nT(n)$ symbol periods, then, as $n \to \infty$, either Willie can detect her with high probability, or Bob cannot decode with arbitrarily low probability of error.*

Proof: Willie divides the sequence $\mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{w}}$ of $nT(n)$ observations into a set of $T(n)$ non-overlapping subsequences $\{\mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{w}}(t)\}_{t=1}^{T(n)}$, with each $\mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{w}}(t)$ containing n consecutive observations. Denote by $Y_t = \sum_{y_i \in \mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{w}}(t)} y_i^2$ the observed power in each subsequence and $Y_{\max} = \max_{t \in \{1,\ldots,T(n)\}} Y_t$. For a threshold τ, Willie accuses Alice of transmitting if $Y_{\max} > \tau$.

Suppose Alice does not transmit. Willie's probability of false alarm is $\mathbb{P}(Y_{\max} > \tau)$. Let $\tau = \sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2(n + \sqrt{n}\delta)$. To find δ so that Willie's detector has an arbitrary probability of false alarm $\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{FA}}^*$ as $n \to \infty$, note that each $Y_t = \sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2 X_t$ where $\{X_t\}$, $X_t \sim \chi_n^2$, $t = 1, \ldots, T(n)$ is a sequence of i.i.d. chi-squared random variables each with n degrees of freedom. We have

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_{\max} > \tau) = 1 - \mathbb{P}\left(X_{\max} \leq \tau/\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2\right) = 1 - \left(1 - \mathbb{P}\left(X_1 > n + \sqrt{n}\delta\right)\right)^{T(n)} \tag{45}$$

where $X_{\max} = \max_{t\in\{1,\ldots,T\}} X_t$. For the desired $\mathbb{P}^*_{\text{FA}}$, $1-(1-\mathbb{P}^*_{\text{FA}})^{1/T(n)} = \mathbb{P}\left(X_1 > n+\sqrt{n}\delta\right)$. Using a Chernoff bound for the tail of a chi-squared distribution [22, Lemma 2.2], we obtain:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(X_1 > n+\sqrt{n}\delta\right) \leq e^{\frac{n}{2}\log\left(1+\frac{\delta}{\sqrt{n}}\right)-\frac{\sqrt{n}\delta}{2}} \tag{46}$$

$$= e^{-\delta^2/4+\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{n})} \tag{47}$$

where (47) results from a Taylor series expansion of $\log(1+x)$ at $x=0$. Discarding low order terms and solving (47) for δ yields $\delta = 2\sqrt{-\log\left(1-(1-\mathbb{P}^*_{\text{FA}})^{1/T(n)}\right)}$. Taylor series expansion of $1-c^x$ at $x=0$ yields $1-(1-\mathbb{P}^*_{\text{FA}})^{1/T(n)} = \frac{1}{T(n)}\log\left(\frac{1}{1-\mathbb{P}^*_{\text{FA}}}\right) + \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{T^2(n)})$. Thus, setting $\delta = c\sqrt{\log T(n)}$ with some constant $c>0$ yields the desired probability of false alarm $\mathbb{P}^*_{\text{FA}}$.

Now suppose Alice uses an arbitrary codebook $\{\mathbf{c}(W_k), k=1,\ldots,2^{nR}\}$ and transmits codeword $\mathbf{c}(W_k)$ using n consecutive symbol periods. Denote the average symbol power of $\mathbf{c}(W_k)$ by $P_{\text{f}} = \frac{\|\mathbf{c}(W_k)\|^2}{n}$. Since Alice uses n consecutive symbols, her transmission overlaps at most two of Willie's subsequences, which we denote t_{A} and t_{B}. Denote by P_{A} and P_{B} the power from Alice's transmission in subsequences t_{A} and t_{B}, respectively, with $P_{\text{A}}+P_{\text{B}} = nP_{\text{f}}$. Willie's probability of missing Alice's transmission is

$$\mathbb{P}^{(k)}_{\text{MD}} = \mathbb{P}(Y_{\max}\leq\tau) = \mathbb{P}(Y_{t_{\text{A}}}\leq\tau)\mathbb{P}(Y_{t_{\text{B}}}\leq\tau)\prod_{\substack{t=1\\ t\notin\{t_{\text{A}},t_{\text{B}}\}}}^{T(n)}\mathbb{P}(Y_t\leq\tau) \tag{48}$$

where the factorization in (48) is because Alice's codeword and the noise in other subsequences are independent. $\prod_{t=1,t\notin\{t_{\text{A}},t_{\text{B}}\}}^{T(n)}\mathbb{P}(Y_t\leq\tau)\leq 1$ does not depend on Alice's codeword. However, since the codeword is an unknown deterministic signal that is added to AWGN on Willie's channel to Alice, $\frac{Y_{t_{\text{A}}}}{\sigma^2_{\text{w}}}\sim\chi^2_n(P_{\text{A}})$ and $\frac{Y_{t_{\text{B}}}}{\sigma^2_{\text{w}}}\sim\chi^2_n(P_{\text{B}})$ are non-central chi-squared random variables with n degrees of freedom and respective non-centrality parameters $\frac{P_{\text{A}}}{\sigma^2_{\text{w}}}$ and $\frac{P_{\text{B}}}{\sigma^2_{\text{w}}}$. Without loss of generality, assume that $P_{\text{A}}\geq P_{\text{B}}$. Thus, P_{A} satisfies $\frac{nP_{\text{f}}}{2}\leq P_{\text{A}}\leq nP_{\text{f}}$ and the expected value and variance of $Y_{t_{\text{A}}}$ are bounded as follows [23, App. D.1]:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[Y_{t_{\text{A}}}\right] \geq \sigma^2_{\text{w}}n + \frac{nP_{\text{f}}}{2} \tag{49}$$

$$\text{Var}\left[Y_{t_{\text{A}}}\right] \leq 2n\sigma^4_{\text{w}} + 4n\sigma^2_{\text{w}}P_{\text{f}} \tag{50}$$

Since $\mathbb{P}(Y_{t_{\mathrm{B}}} \leq \tau) \leq 1$, Chebyshev's inequality with (49) and (50) yields

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{MD}}^{(k)} \leq \mathbb{P}\left(|Y_{t_{\mathrm{A}}} - \mathbb{E}[Y_{t_{\mathrm{A}}}]| > \mathbb{E}[Y_{t_{\mathrm{A}}}] - \sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2(n + c\sqrt{n \log T(n)})\right) \leq \frac{2\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^4 + 4\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2 P_{\mathrm{f}}}{\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}P_{\mathrm{f}}}{2} - c\sigma_{\mathrm{w}}^2\sqrt{\log T(n)}\right)^2}. \tag{51}$$

Therefore, if $P_{\mathrm{f}} = \omega\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log T(n)}{n}}\right)$, as $n \to \infty$, $\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{e}}^{(\mathrm{w})}$ can be made arbitrarily small. The proof of the non-zero lower bound on the decoding error probability $\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{e}}^{(\mathrm{b})}$ if Alice tries to transmit $\omega(\sqrt{n \log T(n)})$ bits in a single slot using average symbol power $P_{\mathrm{f}} = \mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log T(n)}{n}}\right)$ follows from the arguments in the proof of Theorem 2 in [2], [3]. ■

Remark

Attempting to transmit $\omega(\sqrt{n \log T(n)})$ bits in a single slot while maintaining covertness by using average symbol power $P_{\mathrm{f}} = \mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log T(n)}{n}}\right)$ results in the non-zero lower bound on the decoding error probability $\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{e}}^{(\mathrm{b})}$. However, a natural question is whether it is possible to transmit $\omega(\sqrt{n \log T(n)})$ covert bits *in expectation*. If this were possible, then Alice and Bob could employ error correction coding to achieve throughput that exceeds the limit imposed by the codebook construction in the proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. However, we can use the arguments in the remark that follows the proof of Theorem 2 in [3] to demonstrate that the expected number of covert bits transmissible in a single slot cannot exceed $\mathcal{O}\left(\min\{\sqrt{n \log T(n)}, n\}\right)$, obviating any additional layers of error control coding.

V. Discussion

Here we relate our work to other studies of covert communication. An overview of the area can be found in [24].

A. Relationship with Steganography

Covert communication is an ancient discipline [25] of hiding messages in innocuous objects. Modern steganographic systems [26] hide information by altering the properties of fixed-size,

finite-alphabet covertext objects (e.g. images), and are subject to a similar SRL as covert communication: $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n})$ symbols in covertext of size n may safely be modified to hide an $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n}\log n)$-bit message [27]. The similarity between the SRLs in these disciplines is from the mathematics of statistical hypothesis testing, as discussed in [3]. However, in steganography, the transmission to Bob is noiseless, which allows the extra $\log n$ factor.

Batch steganography uses multiple covertext objects to hide a message and is subject to the steganographic SRL described above [28], [29]. The batch steganography interpretation of covert communication using the timing-based degree-of-freedom that is described here is equivalent to using only one of $T(n)$ covertext objects of size n to embed a message. Willie, who knows that one covertext object is used but not which one, has to examine all of them. We are not aware of any work on this particular problem, but it is likely that one could extend our result to it. We also note that more recent work on steganography shows that an empirical model of the covertext suffices to break the steganographic SRL, allowing the embedding of $\mathcal{O}(n)$ bits in an n-symbol covertext [30]. However, this technique relies on embedding messages in covertext by *replacing* part of it—something that cannot be done in standard communication systems unless Alice controls Willie's noise source.

B. Related Work in Physical Layer Covert Communication

The emergence of radio-frequency (RF) communication systems necessitated the development of means to protect them from jamming, detection, and eavesdropping. Spread-spectrum techniques [31] address these issues by transmitting a signal that requires bandwidth W_{M} on a much wider bandwidth $W_{\mathrm{s}} \gg W_{\mathrm{M}}$, thus, effectively suppressing the power spectral density of the signal below the noise floor. This provides both covertness as well as the resistance to jamming, fading, and other interference.

However, while the spread-spectrum architectures are well-developed, the fundamental SRL for covert communication has been derived only recently [2], [3]. This resulted in the revival of the field, with follow-on work focusing on reducing the size of the pre-shared secret [4],

[5], fully characterizing the optimal constant hidden by the big-$\mathcal{O}$ notation of the SRL [5], [6], and extending the SRL to bosonic channels with Willie limited only by the laws of quantum mechanics [9], [10]. Finally, while here we improve on the SRL by exploiting Willie's ignorance of transmission timing, other studies explore even stronger assumptions on his limitations. In particular, authors in [11], [12], [14] examine the impact of the noise in Willie's channel estimates, which allows $\mathcal{O}(n)$ covert bits to be transmitted in n uses of the channel even when Willie has the upper and lower bounds on the estimates. Thus, positive-rate rather than SRL-governed covert communication is possible when Willie's knowledge of the channel is incomplete.

VI. Conclusion and Future Work

We have shown that secretly pre-arranging a choice of a single n-symbol period slot out of $T(n)$ allows Alice to reliably transmit $\mathcal{O}(\min\{n, \sqrt{n \log T(n)}\})$ bits on an AWGN channel to Bob while rendering Willie's detector arbitrarily close to ineffective. Surprisingly, the multiplicative increase in transmitted information over the result in [2], [3] is obtained without the need for Bob to know which slot holds the transmission if $T(n) < 2^{c_{\mathrm{T}} n}$, where c_{T} is a constant, and, when $T(n) \geq 2^{c_{\mathrm{T}} n}$ only an additive expense of an extra $\log T(n)$ pre-shared secret bits is needed. In the future we plan on combining this work with our recent results on jammer-assisted covert communication [8] to enable covert networks.

Appendix A
Derivation of (8)

Since $S^{(n)}$ is independent of which hypothesis is true, (7) can be re-written:

$$\mathbb{P}(E_{\mathrm{C}}(\tau(n), \delta)) = \frac{1 - F_{S^{(n)}}(\tau(n) + \delta) + F_{S^{(n)}}(\tau(n) - \delta)}{2}. \tag{52}$$

Denote the standard Gaussian distribution function by $\Phi(z) = \int_{-\infty}^{z} \phi(t) dt$ where $\phi(t) = \frac{e^{-t^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}}$ is the standard Gaussian density function. The convergence of $F_{S^{(n)}}(z)$ to $\Phi(z)$ is pointwise in z, and, since $\tau(n)$ is the n^{th} value in an arbitrary sequence, we cannot use this fact directly.



Fig. 3: The real number line partitioned into three regions for the analysis of $\mathbb{P}(E_{\mathrm{C}}(\tau(n),\delta))$. G, H and δ are the constants that we select. $\tau(n)$ satisfying $G \leq \tau(n) \leq H$ is illustrated.

However, let's choose finite constants $G < 0$ and $H > 0$, and partition the real number line into three regions as shown in Figure 3. Clearly, for any n, $\tau(n)$ is in one of these regions. Next we demonstrate that (8) holds for an arbitrary $\tau(n)$ by appropriately selecting G, H, and δ.

Consider $\tau(n) < G$, or region 1 in Figure 3:

$$\mathbb{P}(E_{\mathrm{C}}(\tau(n),\delta)) \geq \frac{1}{2}\left(1 - F_{S^{(n)}}(\tau(n)+\delta)\right) \geq \frac{1}{2}\left(1 - F_{S^{(n)}}(G+\delta)\right). \tag{53}$$

Because the convergence of $F_{S^{(n)}}(z)$ to $\Phi(z)$ is pointwise, given δ, ϵ, and $G = \Phi^{-1}(\epsilon/3) - \delta$, there exists n_2 such that, for all $n \geq n_2$,

$$\mathbb{P}(E_{\mathrm{C}}(\tau(n),\delta)) \geq \frac{1}{2}\left(1 - \Phi(G+\delta) - \frac{\epsilon}{3}\right) = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\epsilon}{3} \tag{54}$$

when $\tau(n) < G$. Similarly for $\tau(n) > H$, or region 3 in Figure 3:

$$\mathbb{P}(E_{\mathrm{C}}(\tau(n),\delta)) \geq \frac{1}{2}F_{S^{(n)}}(\tau(n)-\delta) \geq \frac{1}{2}F_{S^{(n)}}(H+\delta). \tag{55}$$

Again, because the convergence of $F_{S^{(n)}}(z)$ to $\Phi(z)$ is pointwise, given δ, ϵ, and $H = \Phi^{-1}(1 - \epsilon/3) + \delta$, there exists n_3 such that, for $\tau(n) > H$ and all $n \geq n_3$,

$$\mathbb{P}(E_{\mathrm{C}}(\tau(n),\delta)) \geq \frac{1}{2}\left(\Phi(H+\delta) - \frac{\epsilon}{3}\right) = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\epsilon}{3}. \tag{56}$$

Finally, consider $\tau(n)$ satisfying $G \leq \tau(n) \leq H$, or region 2 in Figure 3. Let's assume that H and G are selected so that $H - G$ is an integer multiple of δ (e.g., using larger H than necessary, which results in the RHS of (56) being smaller). Consider a sequence $(x_k)_{k=0}^{(H-G)/\delta+2}$ where $x_0 = G - \delta$, $x_1 = G$, $x_2 = G + \delta$, $x_3 = G + 2\delta, \ldots, x_{(H-G)/\delta} = H - \delta$, $x_{(H-G)/\delta+1} = H$,

$x_{(H-G)/\delta+2} = H + \delta$. Sequence $(x_k)_{k=0}^{(H-G)/\delta+2}$ partitions region 2 into $\frac{H-G}{\delta} + 2$ subregions, and, for any $\tau(n)$ satisfying $G \leq \tau(n) \leq H$, there exists $k \in \left\{0, \ldots, \frac{H-G}{\delta} + 2\right\}$ such that $x_k \leq \tau(n) - \delta < \tau(n) + \delta \leq x_k + 3\delta$, as illustrated in Figure 3. Since $F_{S^{(n)}}(z)$ is monotonic,

$$\mathbb{P}(E_{\mathrm{C}}(\tau(n), \delta)) \geq \frac{1 - F_{S^{(n)}}(x_k + 3\delta) + F_{Z^{(n)}}(x_k)}{2}. \tag{57}$$

Since the convergence of $F_{S^{(n)}}(z)$ to $\Phi(z)$ is pointwise, for a given x_k, δ, and ϵ, there exists m_k such that for all $n \geq m_k$,

$$\mathbb{P}(E_{\mathrm{C}}(\tau(n), \delta)) \geq \frac{1 - \left(\Phi(x_k + 3\delta) + \frac{\epsilon}{6}\right) + \left(\Phi(x_k) - \frac{\epsilon}{6}\right)}{2} = \frac{1}{2}\left(1 - \int_{x_k}^{x_k+3\delta} \phi(t)dt - \frac{\epsilon}{3}\right) \tag{58}$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{3\delta}{2\sqrt{2\pi}} - \frac{\epsilon}{6} \tag{59}$$

where (59) follows from $\phi(t) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}$. Setting $\delta = \frac{\epsilon\sqrt{2\pi}}{9}$ and $n_4 = \max_{\left\{0,\ldots,\frac{H-G}{\delta}\right\}}(m_k)$ yields the desired lower bound for all $n \geq n_4$ when $\tau(n)$ satisfies $G \leq \tau(n) \leq H$.

Thus, for any $\tau(n)$, when $n \geq n_0$ where $n_0 = \max(n_2, n_3, n_4)$, $\mathbb{P}\left(E_{\mathrm{C}}\left(\tau(n), \frac{\epsilon\sqrt{2\pi}}{9}\right)\right) \geq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\epsilon}{3}$.

APPENDIX B
PROOF OF EQUALITY $\frac{1}{2^n}\sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\{-1,1\}^n} \exp\left[a\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\right] = \cosh^n(a)$

We argue by induction on n. The base case $n = 1$ is trivial. Assume the claim holds for n. Now,

$$\frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\{-1,1\}^{n+1}} \exp\left[a\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} x_i\right] = \frac{1}{2\cdot 2^n} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x}\in\{-1,1\}^n \\ x_{n+1}\in\{-1,1\}}} \exp[ax_{n+1}] \exp\left[a\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i\right] = \cosh(a)\cosh^n(a). \tag{60}$$

APPENDIX C
ANALYSIS OF $\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{e}}^{(\mathrm{b})}$ UNDER PEAK POWER CONSTRAINT AND KNOWN t_{A}

Here we analyze Bob's decoding error probability $\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{e}}^{(\mathrm{b})}$ when the transmission time t_{A} is known and Alice uses binary modulation $\{-a, a\}$ that satisfies the peak power constraint and ensures that Willie's detection error probability $\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{e}}^{(\mathrm{w})} \geq \frac{1}{2} - \epsilon$. This appendix provides an alternative to

the analysis of $\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{e}}^{(\mathrm{b})}$ in the proof of Theorem 1.2 in [2], [3] (analysis of $\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{e}}^{(\mathrm{b})}$ in the proof of Theorem 1.2 in [2], [3] contains minor technical errors which do *not* change the main results). The construct presented here is adapted for the proof of Theorem 1.2 in Section III.

Suppose Alice transmits $\mathbf{c}(W_k)$. Recall that $\mathbf{c}(W_k)$ is drawn from a codebook $\{\mathbf{c}(W_m), m = 1, 2, \ldots, 2^M\}$ containing codewords that are independently generated according to $p_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} p_X(x_i)$, where $p_X(-a) = p_X(a) = \frac{1}{2}$. Bob uses an ML decoder which suffers an error event $E_{k\to i}$ when the received vector $\mathbf{y}_b$ is closer in Euclidean distance to codeword $\mathbf{c}(W_i)$, $i \neq k$. The decoding error probability, averaged over all the codebooks, is then:

$$\mathbb{P}_{e}^{(\mathrm{b})} = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{c}(W_k)}\left[\mathbb{P}\left(\cup_{\substack{i=0\\ i\neq k}}^{2^M} E_{k\to i}\right)\right] \leq \sum_{\substack{i=1\\ i\neq k}}^{2^M} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{c}(W_k)}\mathbb{P}(E_{k\to i}), \tag{61}$$

where $\mathbb{E}_X[\cdot]$ denotes the expectation over random variable X, and the inequality is the union bound. Let $\|\mathbf{d}\|_2 = \|\mathbf{c}(W_k) - \mathbf{c}(W_i)\|_2$ denote the Euclidean ($\mathcal{L}_2$) distance between two codewords. Then, by [20, Eq. (3.44)]:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{c}(W_k)}\mathbb{P}(E_{k\to i}) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{d}}\left[Q\left(\frac{\|\mathbf{d}\|_2}{2\sigma_{\mathrm{b}}}\right)\right] \leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{d}}\left[\frac{1}{2}\exp\left(-\frac{\|\mathbf{d}\|_2^2}{8\sigma_{\mathrm{b}}^2}\right)\right], \tag{62}$$

where $Q(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_x^\infty e^{-t^2/2}dt$ and the inequality is because of the upper bound $Q(x) \leq \frac{1}{2}e^{-x^2/2}$ [21, Eq. (5)]. Euclidean distance $\|\mathbf{d}\|_2$ depends on the number of locations j where $\mathbf{c}(W_k)$ and $\mathbf{c}(W_i)$ differ, which is binomially-distributed by construction, where each location is different with probability $\frac{1}{2}$. Since when the codewords are different in j locations, $\|\mathbf{d}\|_2^2 = 4ja^2$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{d}}\left[\frac{1}{2}\exp\left(-\frac{\|\mathbf{d}\|_2^2}{8\sigma_{\mathrm{b}}^2}\right)\right] = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=0}^{n}\exp\left(-\frac{ja^2}{2\sigma_{\mathrm{b}}^2}\right)\binom{n}{j}\frac{1}{2^n} = \frac{1}{2^{n+1}}\left[1+\exp\left(-\frac{a^2}{2\sigma_{\mathrm{b}}^2}\right)\right]^n, \tag{63}$$

where the last equality is an application of binomial theorem. Substitution of (63) into (61) yields

$$\mathbb{P}_{e}^{(\mathrm{b})} \leq 2^{M-n\left(1-\log_2\left[1+\exp\left(-\frac{a^2}{2\sigma_{\mathrm{b}}^2}\right)\right]\right)}. \tag{64}$$

Thus, if Alice attempts to transmit $M = n\gamma\left(1 - \log_2\left[1 + \exp\left(-\frac{a^2}{2\sigma_{\rm b}^2}\right)\right]\right)$ bits, where $\gamma \in (0,1)$ is a constant, Bob's decoding error probability decays to zero as $n \to \infty$. If $a^2 = \mathcal{O}(1)$, then clearly $M = \mathcal{O}(n)$ bits. If $a^2 = o(1)$, then, application of the bounds $\log_2(1+x) \leq \frac{x}{\ln 2}$ and $1 - e^{-x} \geq x - \frac{x^2}{2}$ yields $M = \mathcal{O}(na^2)$. In particular, if $\sigma_{\rm w}^2$ is known to Alice and $a^2 = \frac{2\sqrt{2}\epsilon\sigma_{\rm w}^2}{\sqrt{n}}$ as prescribed by the analysis of Willie's detector in [3, Th. 1.2], $M = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon\sigma_{\rm w}^2\sqrt{n}/\sigma_{\rm b}^2)$.

REFERENCES

[1] BBC, "Edward Snowden: Leaks that exposed US spy programme," http://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-23123964, Jan. 2014.

[2] B. A. Bash, D. Goeckel, and D. Towsley, "Square root law for communication with low probability of detection on AWGN channels," in *Proc. of IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, Cambridge, MA, Jul. 2012.

[3] ——, "Limits of reliable communication with low probability of detection on AWGN channels," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 31, no. 9, pp. 1921–1930, 2013, arXiv:1202.6423.

[4] P. H. Che, M. Bakshi, and S. Jaggi, "Reliable deniable communication: Hiding messages in noise," in *Proc. of IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, Istanbul, Turkey, Jul. 2013, arXiv:1304.6693.

[5] M. Bloch, "Covert communication over noisy memoryless channels: A resolvability perspective," in *Proc. of IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, Hong Kong, China, 2015, arXiv:1503.08778.

[6] L. Wang, G. W. Wornell, and L. Zhang, "Limits of low-probability-of-detection communication over a discrete memoryless channel," in *Proc. of IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, Hong Kong, China, 2015, arXiv:1506:03236.

[7] S. Kadhe, S. Jaggi, M. Bakshi, and A. Sprintson, "Reliable, deniable, and hidable communication over multipath networks," in *Proc. of IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, Honolulu, HI, Jul. 2014, arXiv:1401.4451.

[8] R. Soltani, B. A. Bash, D. Goeckel, S. Guha, and D. Towsley, "Covert single-hop communication in a wireless network with distributed artificial noise generation," in *Proc. of Conf. on Commun., Control, Comp. (Allerton)*, Monticello, IL, 2014.

[9] B. A. Bash, S. Guha, D. Goeckel, and D. Towsley, "Quantum Noise Limited Communication with Low Probability of Detection," in *Proc. of IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, Istanbul, Turkey, Jul. 2013.

[10] B. A. Bash, A. H. Gheorghe, M. Patel, J. L. Habif, D. Goeckel, D. Towsley, and S. Guha, "Covert optical communication," arXiv:1404:7347, University of Massachusetts Technical Report UM-CS-2014-004, 2014.

[11] S. Lee and R. Baxley, "Achieving positive rate with undetectable communication over AWGN and Rayleigh channels," in *Proc. of IEEE Int. Conf. Commun. (ICC)*, June 2014, pp. 780–785.

[12] S. Lee, R. Baxley, M. Weitnauer, and B. Walkenhorst, "Achieving undetectable communication," *IEEE J. Sel. Topics Signal Proc.*, 2015, to appear.

[13] J. Hou and G. Kramer, "Effective secrecy: Reliability, confusion and stealth," in *Proc. of IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory (ISIT)*, Honolulu, HI, Jul. 2014, arXiv:1311.1411.

[14] P. H. Che, M. Bakshi, C. Chan, and S. Jaggi, "Reliable deniable communication with channel uncertainty," in *Proc. Inf. Theory Workshop (ITW)*, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia, Nov 2014, pp. 30–34.

[15] T. H. Cormen, C. E. Leiserson, R. L. Rivest, and C. Stein, *Introduction to Algorithms*, 2nd ed. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 2001.

[16] E. Lehmann and J. Romano, *Testing Statistical Hypotheses*, 3rd ed. New York: Springer, 2005.

[17] H. L. Van Trees, *Detection, Estimation, and Modulation Theory, Part I: Detection, Estimation, and Linear Modulation Theory*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2001.

[18] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory*, 2nd ed. John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, NJ, 2002.

[19] P. Billingsley, *Probability and Measure*, 3rd ed. New York: Wiley, 1995.

[20] U. Madhow, *Fundamentals of Digital Communication*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

[21] M. Chiani, D. Dardari, and M. K. Simon, "New exponential bounds and approximations for the computation of error probability in fading channels," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 840–845, Jul. 2003.

[22] S. Dasgupta and A. Gupta, "An Elementary Proof of a Theorem of Johnson and Lindenstrauss," *Random Struct. Algorithms*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 60–65, Jan. 2003.

[23] D. Torrieri, *Principles of Spread-spectrum Communication Systems*. Boston, MA, USA: Springer, 2005.

[24] B. A. Bash, D. Goeckel, S. Guha, and D. Towsley, "Hiding information in noise: Fundamental limits of covert wireless communication," *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 53, no. 12, 2015.

[25] Herodotus, c. 440 BCE, 5.35 and 7.239.

[26] J. Fridrich, *Steganography in Digital Media: Principles, Algorithms, and Applications*, 1st ed. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

[27] A. D. Ker, "The square root law does not require a linear key," in *Proceedings of the 12th ACM workshop on Multimedia and Security*, ser. MM&Sec '10, Roma, Italy, 2010, pp. 213–224.

[28] ——, "A capacity result for batch steganography," *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 14, no. 8, pp. 525–528, Aug. 2007.

[29] ——, "Batch steganography and pooled steganalysis," in *Information Hiding*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, J. L. Camenisch, C. S. Collberg, N. F. Johnson, and P. Sallee, Eds. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2007, vol. 4437, pp. 265–281.

[30] S. Craver and J. Yu, "Subset selection circumvents the square root law," vol. 7541, 2010, pp. 754 103–1–754 103–6.

[31] M. K. Simon, J. K. Omura, R. A. Scholtz, and B. K. Levitt, *Spread Spectrum Communications Handbook*. McGraw-Hill, 1994.